REMARKS/ARGUMENT

A. General:

1. Claims 1-16, 22-37, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 60-65 remain in the application.

B. Drawings:

The Examiner has required the submission of formal drawings with this response. Eight sheets of formal drawings containing Figs. 1 – 8 are enclosed herewith.

C. 103 Rejections:

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 16, 22 – 37, 43, 49, 50, 52 and 61 – 63 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (US 5864844) in view of Best (US 5358259) further in view of Kawamoto et al (US 5367454).

The abstract in Kawamoto et al. states that the invention is: "An interactive man-machine interface system [that] displays an animated face that exhibits human-like emotions." The goal of Kawamoto et al., therefore, is to make a "personified artificial agent" or "electronic agent" (collectively, "agent") (col. 1, lines 25 – 26 and 49) behave more like a human (col. 2, lines 1–2) because the agent appearing on the computer screen in the then existing systems did not have the ability to show a full range of pseudo-emotion (col. 1, lines 48 – 50). As a result, " ... the personification of the agent as viewed from the user is not thoroughgoing and the agent lacking in emotional expressions has not only little affinity for the novice user but also weak power to encourage users in general to input information actively" (col. 1, lines 56 – 61).

To provide a solution to the above, Kawamoto et al. store the intensities of eight basic emotions and vary the intensities thereof in accordance with a task selected by the user (col. 2, lines 12 – 22). The agent's emotional condition can then be immediately

reflected in its facial expression and can quickly change with various happenings in the task performance environment thereby providing a more lifelike "person" on the computer screen with which the user can interact (col. 2, lines 62 – 68, and col. 3, lines 1 –3). Bottom line, as the user makes choices and states those choices to the computer, the agent's facial expression will change so that the interaction is more lifelike for the user.

Applicant's independent claims all recite something much different and more complex and fundamental than the system disclosed by Kawamoto et al. Unlike Kawamoto et al. where a pseudo-emotion model is used to make the agent's face more life-like, Applicant's emotional model is used to drive the logic means which selects one of a plurality of possible audio responses and one of a plurality of possible video vignettes based on statements by the user. As Applicant states in the specification, page 10, line 29, "[the] emotional component is critical in the selection of the response to a question." Whereas Kawamoto et al. is using user input to derive facial expressions, Applicant's emotional model is being used to select the next response in an interactive process with the user where the fundamental goal is providing training to the user and not simply encouraging use of the program by providing a more life-like face on the screen.

Applicant has incorporated the above distinctions in the independent claims by previously amending each independent claim to recite that the emotional model that comprises the personality profile emulator determines the direction and magnitude of change between a plurality of emotional states of the simulated person in response to the statements selected by the user which then controls the selection of audio responses and video vignettes. Selection of audio responses and video vignettes to further an interactive process for training purposes is much different than simply generating facial expressions. Based on the above, Applicant submits that because Kawamoto et al. is only directed to generating a life-like face on a computer screen it cannot be combined with the other cited references to render obvious claims 1 – 16, 22 – 37, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 61-63.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 60, 64, and 65 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harless (US 5730603) in view of Best (US 5358259) further in view of Kawamoto et al (US 5367454).

For the reasons discussed above, Harless, Best, and Kawamoto et al. in combination do not disclose or suggest a system that utilizes a personality profile emulator comprising an emotional model of a simulated person to control the selection of responses to a user selected statement wherein the emotional model determines the direction and magnitude of change between a plurality of emotional states of the simulated person in response to the statements selected by the user which then controls the selection of audio responses and video vignettes, and, therefore, they cannot render obvious claims 60, 64, and 65.

D. **Conclusion:**

In view of the above, Applicant submits that each of the presently pending claims in this application is in immediate condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested. Allowance of claims 1-16, 22-37, 43, 49, 50, 52, and 60-65 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
Applied Physics Laboratory

Francis A. Cooch

Francis A. Cooch
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,495

Date 10/27/2004

FACooch/cls
(240) 228-5640
Enclosures: Eight sheets of formal drawings